



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,447	08/20/2001	William D. Hogan	2380-464	3509

7590 10/07/2005
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

CONTEE, JOY KIMBERLY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2686

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the Double Patenting rejection, filed January 5, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the independent claims stress that the drift radio network controller (DRNC) transmits a filtering rule..." , hence not to be anticipated by U.S. Pub. 2003/0013443 to Willars et al. Examiner acknowledges that Willars et al. describes in at least claim 1, "transmitting to the user equipment unit a message including a filtered list of cells, the filtered list of cells including the first subset but not the second subset. However, Examiner has maintained the obvious type provisional double patenting rejection since the claims are not identical. Examiner contends that the transmitted message must include a filtering rule since Applicant's specification for the instant invention describes the filtering rule to result in a comparison of Ids to determine whats allowed (see pages 4-5 [0014-0015]).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2686

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-62 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6,14,15 and 31-35 of copending Application No. 10/068,012 ('012). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because at least independent claims 1 and 31 of '012 disclose transmitting to the user equipment unit a message including a filtered list of cells the filtered list of cells including the first subset but not the second subset, which is analogous to the instant applications at least independent claims' 1,29 and 48, filtering rule criteria for determining whether the candidate cell qualifies for inclusion in a measurement list of cells.

Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 21-28 and 63-69 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6,14,15 and 31-35 of copending Application No. 10/068,012 ('012), in view of Cutler, Jr. et al. (Cutler), U.S. Patent No. 5,678,184.

At least independent claims 1 and 31 of '012 disclose transmitting to the user equipment unit a message including a filtered list of cells the filtered list of cells

Art Unit: 2686

including the first subset but not the second subset, which is analogous to the instant applications at least independent claims' 1,29 and 48, filtering rule criteria for determining whether the candidate cell qualifies for inclusion in a measurement list of cells.

'012 fails to disclose using the IMSI to determine : (1) whether the measurement list for the user equipment unit should be updated to delete the candidate cell; (2) whether the radio link for the selected cell should be removed.

In a similar field of endeavor, Cutler discloses determining : (1) whether the measurement list for the user equipment unit should be updated to delete the candidate cell; (2) whether the radio link for the selected cell should be removed (col. 2, lines 34-48).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify '012 to include dynamic candidate handoff cell lists for the purpose of allowing subscriber units the handoff process based on local conditions such that poor handoff decisions are not made.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2686

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joy K Contee whose telephone number is 571.272.7906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 571.272.7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571.273.8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JC

Joy K Contee
JOY K CONTEE
PATENT EXAMINER

Marsha D Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600